

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/797,773	RAYES ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DANT B. SHAFER HARRIMAN	2434	

All Participants:

(1) DANT B. SHAFER HARRIMAN.

(2) _____.

Status of Application: _____

(3) Karl T. Rees.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 19 May 2009 **Time:** 2pm

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Thomsen (US Patent NO. 7194004) in view of Renda et al. (US Patent No. 7127524) , 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection.

Claims discussed:

1 - 13, 18 - 20, 30 - 38, 43, 44

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner advised that claim 1 contains allowable subject matter and all dependent claims that depend from claim 1 would also be allowable, , specifically the claim limitations of claim 1:

"in response to the security event, causing the network device to acquire a second network address that is selected from a second subset of addresses within a second specified pool associated with suspected malicious network users; "

" wherein the security event, is an event that indicates at least one of: a possible denial of service attack, possible IP address spoofing, extraneous requests for network addresses, and possible MAC address spoofing."

is what is novel about applicants invention.

The examiner also noted to applicant that if the above limitations are amended into applicants other independent claims, then those independent claims and dependent claims that depend from the indepent claim, would also be allowable.

Then the examiner suggested a examiners amendment, to expedite prosecution of the application to allowance, the applicant replied that the applicant would get back to examiner.

Then on 05/19/2009, applicant sent in through the examiners e-mail, by the examiners request, the amended claims that are to be used in the examiners amendment.